

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated July 16, 2007. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is filed herewith. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Support for the amendments to the claims herein is found at various specific places in the Specification as originally filed. For example, support for the claim amendments herein is found from line 9 on page 28 through line 17 on page 30 of the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

At paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 32 for non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim 32 has been canceled herein.

At paragraphs 2-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32 for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, and claims 2-7, 12-17, and 22-27 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing U.S. patent number 7,076,043 of Curbow et al. ("Curbow et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Curbow et al. disclose a delayed call dialing processing system that includes logic allowing a caller to delegate the task of monitoring presence information to detect when a callee is present to accept a call. When presence information indicates that the caller and the callee are available, Curbow et al. teach that the calls are put through and bridged. In Fig. 3, Curbow et al. show a screen display of a buddy list that maintains names of users, user's last locale information, user's devices, etc., and whether the user is active or idle. The buddy list of Fig. 3 in Curbow et al. provides presence information to the user, and helps a user tell whether another user ("buddy") is available for a phone call or not, is in the office or elsewhere, the device they last used,

whether they are currently active, and calendar information showing the current, or next scheduled appointment.

Nowhere in Curbow et al. is there disclosed or suggested any method or system providing information describing detected uses of communication software applications by remote computer system users to local computer system users, including:

...
obtaining, by said awareness client application process on said local computer system, responsive to said presenting said awareness object associated with said remote computer system user, communication mode activity information regarding said remote computer system user, *wherein said communication mode activity information describes a previous use of each one of a plurality of different communication software applications by said remote computer system user, said plurality of different communication software applications including an electronic mail application;*

detecting a selection of said awareness object associated with said remote computer user by said local computer system user; and

presenting, by said awareness client application process, said communication mode activity information regarding said remote computer system user in a display for said local computer system. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 11, 21, and 31 include analogous features. In contrast, the display generated by Curbow et al. shown in Fig. 3 shows only information regarding the location (reference number 310), access device (reference number 320), time since last active (reference number 330), and calendar appointment information (reference number 340) for each buddy. Curbow et al. disclose user applications updating the user's current activity status with regard to the user's online status, for the purpose of enabling another user to establish a *synchronous* communication session, e.g. phone call, instant messaging session, etc., in which all communicating participants must be simultaneously available. The teachings of Curbow et al. provide no information regarding previous uses of multiple communication software applications, even less regarding even the possibility of

providing or displaying information regarding a user's previous use of an *asynchronous* communication software application, through which a user can send a message to a recipient even when the recipient is not currently online, such as the electronic mail application of the present independent claims.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Curbow et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31. Accordingly, Curbow et al. does not anticipate the present independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102, nor does Curbow et al. render independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103. As to claims 2-7, 12-17, and 22-27, they each depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over Curbow et al. for at least the same reasons.

In paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-10, 18-20 and 28-30 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing the combination of Curbow et al. with United States patent number 6,697,840 of Godefroid et al. ("Godefroid et al."). As the Examiner relies exclusively on Curbow et al. to teach the features of the present independent claims 1, 11 and 21 (as noted in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of dependent claims 8-10, 18-20 and 28-30 based on the combination of Curbow et al. and Godefroid et al. by reference to the above discussion regarding the distinctions of the present independent claims 1, 11 and 21 over Curbow et al.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

November 16, 2007
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-009